

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 14, and 21 being independent claims.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 6, 9, 16 and 18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-13, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kang (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0187818).

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang.

Claims 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view of Park (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0036845).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Examiner stated that Kang discloses each and every element of Claims 1 and 21.

Each of Amended Claims 1 and 21 recites “the main body, the folder, and the camera lens module are rotatable about a same hinge axis.” There is one and only one common hinge axis for all the main body 10, the folder 20, and the camera lens module 100 (FIGs. 1-2). In contrast, Kang teaches a portable phone with camera, the portable phone has a main body 10, a folder 20 and a camera module 30, wherein “it is desirable for folder 20 and camera module 30 to have two different alignments of rotation axes” A and B (see Kang at [0029] and FIG. 5). Kang indeed teaches away the rotation about a same hinge axis of the present invention by requiring that “it is necessary that the folder 20 and the camera module 30 can rotate separately with respect to a main body”. Kang at [0029].

Further, the rotation axis 32 of Kang (FIG. 4, [0028]) can be considered equivalent to the male hinge member 145 of the rear cover 140 shown in FIG. 2 of the present invention. However, it is unreasonable to equate the rotation axis 32 of Kang to the partition 121 of the


housing 120 of the present invention (FIGs. 2 and 5). It is also unreasonable to assert that Kang's camera module 30 is partitioned by Kang's rotation axis 32 (Kang, FIG. 4).

Clearly, each of Amended Claims 1 and 21 structurally differs from Kang.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner stated that Kang in view of Park renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 14 recites "the main body, the folder, and the camera lens module are rotatable about a same hinge axis." As set forth above for Amended Claims 1 and 21, Kang indeed teaches away the rotation about a same hinge axis of the present invention. Amended Claim 14 further recites "a protective transparent lens window" as transparent window 119 in FIG. 2. The transparent window 119 provides shutting off interconnection between internal and external sides to protect the camera lens 131. Meanwhile, Kang fails to disclose or suggest such "a protective transparent lens window." Park also fails to disclose or suggest so.

Clearly, Amended Claim 14 structurally differs from Kang, Park, or combination thereof.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims herein, namely Claims 1-23, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/